Remarks & Arguments

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1-49 are pending in the application, and that Claims 1-49 are rejected. By this amendment, Claims 1, 5, 7, 12, 17, 19, 21, 24, 27, 36, 37, 40, 43, 46 and 48 have been amended and Claims 50-52 have been added. The amendments to the claims do not add new matter to the application. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27 and 29-36 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Admitted Prior Art and Jin et al. (US Patent No. 6,392,286). With regard to independent Claims 1, 12 and 21 as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Admitted Prior Art nor Jin teaches or suggests a manufacturing execution system. Furthermore, with regard to Claims 2, 4, 12, 14, 32 and 33 Jin teaches away from the use of a plasma cleaning station in an in-line integrated semiconductor manufacturing assembly. Jin teaches that an ultraviolet ray cleaning process must be used in an in-line apparatus (col. 7, line 66 through col. 8 line 6). Jin in fact states that "... plasma cleaning chamber and fabrication equipment cannot be actually arranged in-line ..." (col. 7, lines 61-65).

Claims 5, 7, 17, 19, 22, 25, 28 and 37-49 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Admitted Prior Art and Jin, and further in view of Farnworth et al. (US Patent No. 6,549,821). With regard to independent Claims 37, 40, 43, 46 and 48 as amended, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Admitted Prior Art, Jin nor Farnworth teaches or suggest a manufacturing execution system. Furthermore, with regard to Claims 32, 33, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 45 and 47 Jin teaches away from the use of a plasma cleaning station in an in-line integrated semiconductor manufacturing assembly. Jin teaches that an ultraviolet ray cleaning process must be used in an in-line apparatus (col. 7, line 66 through col. 8 line 6). Jin in fact states that "... plasma cleaning chamber and fabrication equipment cannot be actually arranged in-line ..." (col.

For the above advanced reasons Claims 1-52 are patentable in view of Admitted Prior Art, Jin and Farnworth. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-49 is therefore respectfully requested.

7, lines 61-65). Farnworth also does not teach or suggest a plasma cleaning station.

Conclusion

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and that action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 23-0085. In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a Appl. No. 10/085,757

Amdt. Dated September 14, 2004

Reply to Office Action of July 2, 2004

petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: September 14, 2004

to Deposit Account 23-0085.

Eric J. Gash

Registration No. 46,274

Tel.: (408) 938-9060

Two North Market Street

Third Floor

San Jose, CA 95113

(408) 938-9060